COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.:</u> 4723-02 <u>Bill No.:</u> HB 1426

Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Drugs and Controlled Substances; Firearms and

Fireworks; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies

Type: Original

<u>Date</u>: March 22, 2012

Bill Summary: This proposal specifies that a person commits the crime of unlawful use of

weapons if he or she knowingly possess a firearm while also in possession

of a specified amount of a controlled substance.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 4723-02 Bill No. HB 1426 Page 2 of 5 March 22, 2012

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

- □ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- □ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

L.R. No. 4723-02 Bill No. HB 1426 Page 3 of 5 March 22, 2012

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** and the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from **Office of Prosecution Services** assume no measurable fiscal impact from the proposal. The creation of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors which may in turn result in additional costs which are difficult to determine.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials at the **Office of State Public Defender** (**SPD**) cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are faced with the enhanced penalties for possession of a firearm while also in possession of a controlled substance.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases.

Oversight assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state penalty provisions, the component of the bill to have potential fiscal impact for DOC, is for up to a class D felony. Offenders could already be charged for possession of controlled substances pursuant to existing law. Currently, the DOC cannot predict the number of new commitments which may result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in this proposal. An increase in commitments depends on the utilization by prosecutors and the actual sentences imposed by the court.

If additional persons are sentenced to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC will incur a corresponding increase of direct offender costs either through incarceration (FY10 average of \$16.397 per offender, per day, or an annual cost of \$5,985 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY10 average of \$3.92 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$1,431 per offender).

L.R. No. 4723-02 Bill No. HB 1426 Page 4 of 5 March 22, 2012

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The following factors contribute to DOC's minimal assumption:

- DOC assumes the narrow scope of the crime will not encompass a large number of offenders;
- The low felony status of the crime enhances the possibility of plea-bargaining or imposition of a probation sentence;
- The probability exists that offenders would be charged with a similar but more serious offense or that sentences may run concurrent to one another

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in some additional costs, but it is assumed the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

L.R. No. 4723-02 Bill No. HB 1426 Page 5 of 5 March 22, 2012

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Public Safety
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender
Department of Corrections

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

March 22, 2012